DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 748 SP 007 732

TITLE	Achieving the Potential of Performance-Based Teacher Education: Recommendations. PBTE Series No. 16.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
REPORT NO	PBTE-SER-16
PUB DATE	Feb 74
NOTE	54p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Order Dept., American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite 610, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Definitions; Educational Principles; *Guidelines; Historical Reviews; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Problems; Professional Associations

ABSTRACT

This document on performance-based teacher education (PBTE), issued two years after the first publication of AACTE's Committee on PBTE, represents an attempt to clarify key concepts and terminology, call attention to significant potentialities and problems, and suggest future action. Chapter I is a brief introduction. In Chapter II, the committee clarifies what it currently understands to be meant and implied by the phrase "performance-based teacher education." It places the movement in historical perspective; explains differences in terminology commonly used; identifies salient characteristics of PBTE programs; and comments briefly on underlying assumptions, promises, and recommendations on 10 aspects of the PBTE movement, subsumed under three major headings: Program Considerations, Administrative Considerations, and Research Considerations. Chapter IV presents the report's summary and conclusions. Included as appendixes are a comparison between the 1971 and 1974 versions of the committee's definition of the characteristics of PBTE and several comments and statements of special concern. (Author/JA)

AACTE PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION PROJECT COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN: *J. W. Maucker*, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Academic Affairs Office, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas 66801.

VICE-CHAIRMAN: *Donald J. McCarty*, Dean, College of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

William W. Barr, Student, School of Education, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado 80210.

Elbert Brooks, Superintendent of Schools, Metropolitan Schools, 2601 Bransford Avenue, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

Patrick L. Daly, Social Studies Teacher, Edsel Ford High School, 20601 Rotunda Drive, Dearborn, Michigan 48124.

K. Fred Daniel, Associate for Planning and Coordination, State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida 32304.

William H. Drummond, Professor of Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601.

Tommy Fulton, Art Teacher, Jarman Jr. High School, Midwest City, Oklahoma 73110.

William A. Jenkins, Dean, School of Education, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon 97207.

Lorrin Kennamer, Dean, College of Education, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712.

David Krathwohl, Dean, College of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210.

Margaret Lindsey, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027.

Donald M. Medley, Professor of Education, School of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903.

Youra Qualls, Head, Humanities Division, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Institute, Alabama 36088.

Atilano Valencia, Head, Department of Education, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, New Mexico 87001.

(Continued on inside back cover)

ED 087748

ACHIEVING THE POTENTIAL OF PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION: RECOMMENDATIONS

by the AACTE
Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

February 1974

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

SP 007 732

This paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, through the Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas. The opinions expressed herein should not be construed as representing the opinions of the United States Government or the Texas Education Agency.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 74-75839

Standard Book Number: 910052-82-4

Preface

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) is pleased to publish this paper as one of a series of monographs sponsored by its Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education (PBTE). The series is designed to expand the knowledge base about issues, problems, and prospects regarding PBTE as identified in the first publication of the series on the state of the art.[1] While most of the monographs in the series reflect the views of individual authors and are not endorsed by the Committee, this monograph and the first one on the state of the art are Committee papers and carry its endorsement. Not all Committee members and liaison representatives endorse everything that is in the body of this paper. Everyone who contributed to its development was given the opportunity to submit individual statements in which they could register minority positions or special concerns. (See Appendix B). We believe that the publication is enhanced by the inclusion of these statements.

Recommendations emerged from 3 years of studying performance-based teacher education by the Committee. During this period, it established an information clearinghouse; conducted field visits to PBTE programs in operation; sponsored a series of national and regional conferences on PBTE; conducted training seminars for PBTE consultants; deliberated about the issues, problems, and promise of PBTE; consulted with educational leaders; and analyzed the experience of states and institutions of higher education engaged in PBTE. This paper sets forth its recommendations based on the findings of this period of study. As the title suggests, the Committee believes that PBTE has potential for improving the education of teachers and other professional school personnel and offers these recommendations to assist in the realization of its full potential as a viable alternative for teacher education.

This publication includes the contributions not only of the members of AACTE's Committee on PBTE, but also those of persons who served on the Committee as liaison representatives of other major national organizations and agencies concerned about PBTE. The paper, therefore, reflects the conclusions of a broadly representative group of educators who have special expertise about PBTE. In making the recommendations in this paper, the Committee recognizes that some of them have been made earlier by other agencies and organizations. Repetition simply underscores their importance. It also recognizes that some implementation of its recommendations has begun and urges that such efforts be continued and expanded.

Under the guidance of the Committee, AACTE's Performance-Based Teacher Education Project is but one activity in the larger PBTE movement. Many states and institutions of higher education are engaged in implementing the PBTE strategy in their respective areas, and a number of national organizations and agencies are engaged in activities to assist these states and

---

[1]Stanley Elam, *Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art?* (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, December 1971).

institutions.[2] The Committee hopes that its recommendations will be helpful to all of these efforts and to others yet to be undertaken.

The PBTE Project reflects AACTE's commitment to assist colleges and universities to explore and develop more effective ways of preparing educational personnel for our changing society. Earlier Association projects and programs have helped to lay important groundwork for the emergence of PBTE by focusing the thinking of teacher educators on reconceptualizing the nature of professional education, implementing cooperative approaches in teacher education, and developing national standards for teacher education which now incorporate a number of the basic concepts essential to the implementation of PBTE programs.

AACTE acknowledges with appreciation the role of the National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems (NCIES) of the U.S. Office of Education in the PBTE Project. Its financial support as well as its professional stimulation, particularly that of Allen Schmieder, are major contributions to the Committee's work. The Association acknowledges also the contributions of the Committee's Writing Task Force (Margaret Lindsey, Patrick L. Daly, K. Fred Daniel, William H. Drummond, David R. Krathwohl, J.W. Maucker, and Donald J. McCarty) and other members of the Committee who participated in the preparation of this monograph. The contributions of liaison representatives Theodore Andrews, Don Orlosky, Benjamin Rosner, and Emmitt Smith were particularly helpful. AACTE is especially indebted to J.W. Maucker, chairman of the PBTE Committee from 1970-1973, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Kansas State Teachers College, who skillfully integrated the many contributions of Committee members and served as the Committee's writer of this paper. Recognition is also due members of the Project staff for their contributions to the development of the PBTE Series of monographs.

EDWARD C. POMEROY
Executive Director, AACTE

KARL MASSANARI
Associate Director, AACTE
and Director, PBTE Project

---

[2]Allen A. Schmieder, *Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene.* (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, February 1973).

Contents

	Page
Preface	
ACHIEVING THE POTENTIAL OF PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION: RECOMMENDATIONS	
Chapter I Introduction	1
Purpose	1
Perspective of the Committee	2
Audience	2
Organization	3
Chapter II Context for Viewing PBTE	4
Need for Clarification	4
Historical Context	5
Current Factors and Assumptions	6
Characteristics of PBTE Programs	7
Essential Characteristics of PB Instruction	7
Characteristics When Performance-Based Is Applied to Teacher Education	9
PBTE versus CBTE	10
Potentialities and Pitfalls	11
Chapter III Observations and Recommendations	13
Program Considerations	14
Topic 1 - Role Definition	14
Topic 2 - Development, Validation, and Dissemination of Instructional Materials	15
Topic 3 - Role of the Student in the Instructional Process	17
Topic 4 - Assessment	18

Page

Administrative Considerations 20

Topic 5 - Collaborative Decision Making 20

Topic 6 - Management 22

Topic 7 - Costs and Funding 23

Topic 8 - Mandating 24

Topic 9 - Accreditation and Program Approval 26

Research Considerations 27

Topic 10 - Research Design 27

Chapter IV Summary and Conclusions 28

Appendix A - Essential Defining Characteristics of PBTE as Viewed by the AACTE Committee 32

Appendix B - Statements of Special Concern 34

By Emmitt D. Smith 34

By Patrick L. Daly 35

By William H. Drummond 38

By David R. Krathwohl 40

About AACTE

About the Texas Teacher Center Project

The AACTE Board of Directors

AACTE Special Series on PBTE

Order Form for Recent AACTE Publications

ACHIEVING THE POTENTIAL OF PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION: RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

Purpose

In its initial publication in December 1971,[1] the AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education sought to report what was going on around the country under the rubric of Performanced-Based Teacher Education (PBTE). Now, two years later, the Committee seeks to give some direction to the performance-based (or, as some prefer, competency-based) approach to teacher education[2] by

1. further clarifying key concepts and terminology,
2. calling attention to significant potentialities and possible pitfalls of this approach, and
3. suggesting some specific steps to maximize the attainment of the potentialities and avoid the pitfalls.

This paper is not intended to be a comprehensive revision of the original state of the art publication. It does not purport to indicate where good or poor work is being done or where the workers in the vineyard can get practical help. It makes no attempt to treat PBTE exhaustively. It is a series of observations and recommendations--a commentary--rather than a definitive treatment of the subject. It does, however, reflect some modifications in the Committee's thinking and is probably most proficably read in conjunction with the earlier publication.

---

[1]Stanley Elam, *Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art?* (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, December 1971).

[2]The phrase "teacher education" is used herein with direct reference to the preparation of teachers for elementary and secondary schools, but it is the Committee's conviction that the same basic approach is applicable to the preparation of supervisors, principals, and all other professional educational personnel.

Perspective of the Committee

The reader should know from what perspective the Committee writes. In accordance with its original mandate from the AACTE Board of Directors, the Committee has consistently sought to avoid a bandwagon approach. It has tried to look critically at the rationale advanced by theoreticians in support of PBTE and the replies of their critics, to analyze what is being done in teacher education programs, and to encourage constructive discussion through conferences and publications. Committee members differ sharply with one another on many specific issues with respect to PBTE. But, by and large, they believe that the logic of the performance-based approach as they understand it holds considerable promise as *one* approach to reform or improvement in teacher education, not the only approach, but a promising one. They see the achievement of its promise threatened by certain misunderstandings, confusion, problems, actions, and lack of action, hence, their recommendations to help the movement achieve its potential.

In referring to the need for improvement in teacher education, the Committee does not wish to join the chorus of those who blame the schools and the teachers for the widely recognized malaise of the present period. There is much to praise in our schools and more to praise about those who labor in the classrooms with enthusiasm and dedication. Nevertheless, in times of rapid social change--and certainly ours is such a time--educators have a continuing obligation to examine and re-examine their goals and define them with as much clarity and precision as possible. They must ask themselves how the experiences of their students relate to the objectives the schools are supposed to help the students achieve. This the PBTE movement seeks to do.

Motivated toward the improvement of schools, convinced that PBTE faces serious problems but offers substantial promise, striving for objectivity--such is the stance from which the AACTE Committee speaks at this juncture.[3]

Audience

This publication is directed to those who are engaged in, or directly responsible for, the education of teachers for our schools. It is written for "the profession" broadly defined to include elementary and secondary school teachers and administrators, college faculty and administrators, government officials responsible for the operation of schools, professional associations of educators. One would hope it might be of interest also to laymen on boards of education or in legislative bodies.

---

[3]The reader should probably be aware, also, that the specific Committee referred to herein officially terminated its work on August 31, 1973. This is, in effect, its swan song. A reconstituted committee with an advisory council is continuing the AACTE project in this field but may, of course, take a different approach to the matter.

Organization

In Chapter II, the Committee clarifies what it currently understands to be meant and implied by the phrase "performance-based teacher education." It places the movement in historical perspective, explains differences in terminology commonly used, identifies salient characteristics of performance-based programs, and comments briefly on underlying assumptions, promise, and pitfalls.

In Chapter III, the Committee makes a series of observations and recommendations on ten aspects of the PBTE movement, subsumed under three major headings: program considerations, administrative considerations, and research considerations.

Finally, in Chapter IV, the Committee makes its concluding bow, summarizing briefly its hopes, fears, and beliefs concerning PBTE.

Chapter II
CONTEXT FOR VIEWING PBTE

Need for Clarification

When a phrase like PBTE begins to appear in professional literature, on conference programs, and in guidelines for preparation of research proposals, skeptics quite properly ask, "Now, just what does it mean? Is this a new concept in teacher education, a new name for an old concept, or just Madison Avenue gimmickry?"

The Committee recognized an obligation to make clear what it means when it uses the phrase. But the problem to clarification is not simple. It would be correct, but not very helpful, to say, "PBTE is the application of a systems approach to the education of teachers for American schools;" or "PBTE is a strategy for education of teachers that demands that ends be carefully defined, processes relevant, feedback utilized."

It could be pointed out, as in the Elam report,[4] that, in contrast to conventional teacher education (which is sometimes described as "experience-based" or "course-based"), PBTE stresses demonstrated product or output:

> In performance-based programs performance goals are specified, and agreed to, in rigorous detail in advance of instruction. The student must be able to demonstrate his ability to promote desirable learning or exhibit behaviors known to promote it. He is held accountable, not for passing grades, but for attaining a given level of competency in performing the essential tasks of teaching.[5]

But such statements may raise more questions than they answer. What is a systems approach? Processes relevant to what? Whose performance determines the goals?

Consequently, the Committee has tried to clarify its meaning by placing its definition and explication in a broad context. This it seeks to do by (a) calling attention to some of the historical antecedents of PBTE, (b) indicating what it considers to be the salient characteristics of a performance-based approach to *any* instructional task, (c) describing additional characteristics of programs in which such a performance-based approach is applied to the education of teachers for American schools, and (d) commenting on what it believes to be the power latent in the basic conception of PBTE and the dangers of undertaking it without an adequate grasp of its implications.

---

[4]Throughout this publication the original statement of the views of the AACTE Committee (in December, 1971) will be referred to as "the Elam report."

[5]Elam, op. cit., p.1.

Historical Context *

One of the persistent problems in American teacher education has been to effectively relate the preparation of teachers to the job they are expected to do in the schools and to emerging social conditions. Changes in what society expects of its schools, in what is to be taught, in the pupils' backgrounds, in the instructional materials available, in the role of the teacher outside the classroom--all have kept placing new demands on teacher education. Human nature being what it is and teacher-preparing institutions having traditionally been operated at quite some distance from the schools, teacher preparation has tended to get increasingly out of date. When the gap between what the teacher is prepared to do and what the teacher is in fact called on to do has grown too great, reform movements have developed to break the old teacher education molds and create new patterns. Such efforts have sometimes established new orthodoxies which ultimately proved to be irrelevant to changing school conditions. PBTE is, in the judgment of the Committee, a response to this continuing challenge.** Its roots lie deep in the development of teacher education during the last 100 years.

In the nineteenth century, for example, the establishment of common schools led directly to the creation of a new type of teacher education institution and program in this country--the normal school, which in turn developed into the teacher college with a substantially expanded program. In the early years of the twentieth century new knowledge resulting from a movement stressing the "scientific study of education" led to fairly widespread agreement on a group of courses in education which constituted the recognized core for professional preparation of teachers. As the schools were democratized, they began accepting an obligation to provide secondary education for an increasingly large segment of the population, and a reaction against certain aspects of the lock-step system of mass education then in vogue helped bring into being a reform movement known as progressive education emphasizing the individualization of education. This broad effort stressed laboratory experiences to make teacher education more realistic and it emphasized behavioral objectives, particularly as advocated by Ralph Tyler, to sharpen goals and facilitate measurement of outcomes. More recently, in a more dramatic and specific way, the impact of the Russian Sputnik on the American public led to Congressional action encouraging reform in the schools with respect to the teaching of science and mathematics. This reform encompassed major curriculum changes and a far-flung program of in-service institutes for teachers, as well as substantial changes in their preservice preparation.

---

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Drummond in Appendix B-3.

**See statement of special concern by Committee member Drummond in Appendix B-3.

Current Factors and Assumptions

PBTE is thus seen to have numerous antecedents in its call for greater realism and rigor in the definition of the goals of teacher education and in the methods of achieving such goals. As Elam pointed out, the increasing recognition of the inadequacy of results commonly obtained in schools serving minority group children, the demand of both college students and in-service teachers for greater "relevance" in teacher education programs, and the desire of researchers for increased clarity and precision in teacher education have tended to create a climate favorable to a performance-based approach. At the same time, efforts to apply new management techniques coupled with demands for accountability have raised complex, controversial issues.

The Committee has nothing new to add to the treatment of the background of PBTE as stated in the Elam report,[6] but it does wish to assert more explicitly than in the Elam report its conviction that the following assumptions do in fact underlie the PBTE movement and must continue to do so:

1. The teacher must be conceived of as, prepared as, and function as a professional in the full sense of the term. The teacher must be able to diagnose and prescribe in educational settings just as a physician does with respect to medical problems and services. Furthermore, the teacher must keep in touch throughout his professional career with a growing body of knowledge and adapt his practice to changing conditions. The concept of a teacher as one who develops a set of skills in preservice preparation and then uses them to carry out fixed sets of procedures prescribed by "higher authorities" throughout his career is specifically rejected.
2. Knowledge of the relationships between teacher education programs, teacher behavior, and pupil outcomes must be greatly improved and more widely disseminated. Just as medical research is recognized as crucial in undergirding the practice of the medical profession, efforts to improve the knowledge base available to the teacher educator and the teacher practitioner in the schools must be given high priority.*
3. The development of PBTE on a large scale, requiring cooperative effort of the total educational profession, could provide a vehicle and a language for unification and strengthening of the profession.

---

[6]Elam, op.cit., pp.2-5.

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Drummond in Appendix B-3.

Characteristics of PBTE Programs

The Elam report sought to give substance to the term PBTE by enumerating in considerable detail what the Committee considered to be "Essential Elements," "Implied Characteristics," and "Related and Desirable Characteristics" of PBTE programs. The Committee's conception of PBTE has not changed in any significant respect since the publication of that report, but it is clear from discussions at the regional conferences, inquiries at the AACTE office, and surveys of the literature that definitional problems still exist. Hence, the Committee wishes herein to approach the characterization of PBTE in a somewhat different manner.

PBTE represents the application of a formal system for managing instruction to the task of educating teachers for American schools. Some of its characteristics are inherent in any modern management system; some stem from the nature of the American schools. It may, therefore, be helpful to describe first the characteristics of any program in which this system for managing instruction is utilized, then to consider additional characteristics, including controversial value considerations, which result from the application of the management system to the specific task of developing teachers for American schools.

Essential Characteristics of PB Instruction

In the judgment of the Committee, the essential characteristics of *any* performance-based instructional program are

1. The instructional program is designed to bring about learner achievement of specified competencies (or performance goals) which have been
   - .derived from systematic analysis of the performance desired as end product (usually that of recognized practitioners) and
   - .stated in advance of instruction in terms which make it possible to determine the extent to which competency has been attained.
2. Evidence of the learner's achievement
   - .is obtained through assessment of learner performance, applying criteria stated in advance in terms of expected levels of accomplishment under specified conditions and
   - .is used to guide the individual learner's efforts, to determine his rate of progress and completion of the program and, ideally, to evaluate the efficacy of the instructional system and add to the general body of knowledge undergirding the instructional process.

The foregoing implies, of course, that

1. Instruction is individualized to a considerable extent.
2. Learning experiences are guided by feedback.
3. The program as a whole has the characteristics of a system.*
4. Emphasis is on exit requirements.
5. The learner is considered to have completed the program only when he has demonstrated the required level of performance.
6. The instructional program is not time-based in units of fixed duration.

---

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Drummond in Appendix B-3.

The point should be made, also, that the term "competencies" in the statement of essential characteristics does not refer solely to discrete skills and descriptive knowledge but may include much more complex attributes such as the ability to marshal evidence, to reason logically, to appreciate beauty, etc.

The formula for performance-based instruction is deceptively simple: *careful definition of performance goals in assessable terms and guidance of instruction by evaluation of learner performance.* It might well be argued that any sensible approach to instruction includes formulation of goals and assessment of student progress. And so it does. The essential distinction lies in the degree of explicitness and realism with which goals are defined--their direct relationship to the learner performance ultimately desired--and the degree of rigor with which the evaluative process is carried out in direct consonance with the stated goals. The stress on performance is intended to lead those responsible for the instructional program constantly to check that program against the goal it is ultimately intended to achieve--the desired performance of the practitioner--not to be satisfied with attainment of proximate goals within the instructional process which tend over time to become ends in themselves.*

It is important to recognize that the characteristics listed above would apply to any performance-based instructional program regardless of the age of the learners, the type or complexity of the learning task, or the values of the society in which it was carried on. They would apply to marksmanship instruction in Hitler Germany, teaching of Red Cross lifesaving to adults in Russia, or teaching prospective teachers in America how to diagnose reading difficulties. If the program met the above criteria, it would be performance-based instruction. It should be noted that nothing is said about instructional techniques, the usual focus of discussions of instructional programs. Under the foregoing definition, a wide variety of instructional techniques may be used--lecture, discussion, laboratory exercises, problem solving, field experience, micro-teaching, game playing, etc. The specific technique used is not unique to the concept of performance-based instruction and, therefore, does not enter into the definition. It is generally the case in actual practice that instruction is individualized to a considerable degree and that various forms of simulation are used, but these are not essential defining characteristics. Moreover, the concept implies no special relationship between the learner and the instructor and no particular role for the student other than the traditional one of "doing his lessons."

Performance-based instruction, so defined, is a powerful model, minimizing waste in the learning process by clearly defining goals and by the continuous use of feedback. It is limited in that it can be applied with full rigor only where the objectives sought can be defined in advance in terms which allow the degree of attainment to be verified. This requirement makes it difficult (but not inherently impossible) to apply the process where the outcomes sought are complex and subtle and particularly where they are of an affective nature.

---

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Drummond in Appendix B-3.

Characteristics When Performance-Based Is Applied to Teacher Education

Some argue that what counts is the management system and that this highly significant topic is not properly the concern of this Committee. The Committee disagrees. It believes that, as a specific application of performance-based instruction, the concept of "performance-based *teacher education*" takes on additional characteristics stemming primarily from the values desired in the performance of a specific group of practitioners: the teachers in school systems throughout the United States. It believes that several of these value assumptions are so basic and have such crucial implications that to overlook or ignore them is to provide an inadequate analysis of PBTE. It is assumed as basic that

1. Teachers are to be prepared and to keep themselves up to date as professionals, in command of a growing body of professional knowledge, and
2. Teachers are to work in school systems where democratic values are paramount.

At this point, in moving from performance-based instruction to performance-based teacher education, significant questions of societal and professional values come squarely to the fore. Some have important implications for the instructional process. For example, the experiences of the prospective teacher or, in-service teacher during the learning process and what he learns about himself as a person may be as important as what he learns about specific teaching tasks. Moreover, he is learning to be a designer of instruction as well as an instructor. This means that the system must not be a completely closed affair in which the student simply goes through the motions required by the system designers. There must be sufficient alternatives and options with respect both to proximate goals and to methods of learning to provide challenge and opportunity for adaptation by the learner during the learning process. It means also that instruction generally moves from mastery of specific, partial techniques toward the diagnosis and selective utilization in combination of such techniques in broadly inclusive situations--in other words, role integration takes place as the learner gains an increasingly comprehensive perception of the teaching situation.*

In addition, a performance-based teacher education program usually has other characteristics, listed as "desirable" in the Elam report:

1. The program is to a considerable extent field-centered--to enhance realism.
2. There is a broad base for decision making--for logistical reasons as well as the requirements of democracy and professionalism.
3. Instruction is often modularized and uses protocol and training materials--to achieve flexibility and realism within the college setting.
4. Professional preparation is career-long--inherent in the concept of the professional teacher.
5. A research component is often built into the program--to enhance the knowledge base on which the profession depends.

---

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Drummond in Appendix B-3.

The question may reasonably be asked, "How does the Committee's conception of the meaning and implications of PBTE differ in 1973 from what it was in 1971 when the Elam report was prepared?"[7] In three respects:

1. The Committee would now say that the use of modules is not a necessary, defining characteristic of PBTE programs but simply a practice commonly followed in order to facilitate adaptation of instruction to individual needs and abilities. It often helps materially to avoid a rigidly time-based instructional design.
2. The Committee would now place much greater emphasis than earlier on the significance in the design of teacher education programs of stating formal hypotheses and setting up evidence-gathering and record-keeping systems so as to facilitate the testing of such hypotheses.* This is in recognition of the key importance of building the knowledge base which it sees as a sine qua non for a full-fledged profession.
3. The earlier report may have given the impression that goals (competencies) which cannot be defined in assessable terms should be eliminated. Not so. The obligation is to strive for clarity, rigor, explicit definition. But if the teacher educator is convinced that something belongs in the program even though he cannot measure it, he should feel perfectly free to include it but recognize that that aspect of his program is not performance-based. It may simply be conviction-based.

Although it was not explicitly stated in the Elam paper, the Committee believes that if a program, or an identifiable portion thereof, does not exhibit the essential characteristics to an appreciable degree, it should not be designated as PBTE. It is perfectly legitimate, however, to be operating a properly labelled teacher education program which is partly performance-based and partly not.

PBTE versus CBTE

Considerable energy has been consumed--some within the councils of the AACTE Committee--in arguing the relative merits of the phrases "performance-based teacher education" and "competency-based teacher education." Some proponents of CBTE apparently believe the word "performance," with its connotation of physical activity, minimizes the importance of professional knowledge and the conceptualization and planning which may not be visible when a teacher "performs" in the classroom. They believe the term "performance" is too narrow, that it may encourage mimicry and superficial role-playing rather than the solid professional insight and ability which enable a good teacher to cope with novel situations.

Proponents of PBTE counter that for many persons the term "competency" connotes emphasis upon knowledge rather than practice and hence is likewise too narrow. They feel that the current movement is in significant part a reaction against programs which turned out teachers who were competent in the sense that they could make high scores on National Teacher Examinations

---

[7]See Appendix for a point-by-point comparison of the five essential elements as found in the Elam report and as recently modified slightly by the Committee.

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Drummond in Appendix B-3.

or do well on master's degree orals but could not in fact perform well in the practical teaching situation. They feel further that emphasis upon identification of specific competencies leads to artificial fragmentation of the teaching process and to a "checking off" of competencies which is little improvement over credit-counting.

This conflict may be reconciled, the Committee believes, by recognizing that if one is pressed to define his terms, both concepts are necessary. Those who prefer *P*BTE do not claim that teacher education should be based on just any performance but on competent performance. "Competence" is understood, taken for granted. PBTE really means (C)PBTE. Likewise, those who prefer *C*BTE are not talking about competence in a limited pedantic sense but about competence in teaching performance. In this case "performance" is understood, taken for granted. CBTE really means C(P)BTE. Both concepts are necessary. Both are included in the essential characteristics of performance-based instruction as outlined earlier in this chapter.

The AACTE Committee decided to stay with its original title, largely for reasons of convenience and because it saw no compelling reason to change. It is perfectly happy if anyone else wishes to use the term CBTE where it uses PBTE and considers the terms interchangeable within the context of its work.

Potentialities and Pitfalls

As has been implied throughout this chapter, the unique strength of PBTE is that it challenges all who touch it to be open about their intentions and explicit about how they will decide if their hopes are fulfilled. The ends--at bottom nothing less than the purposes of American education--must be made as explicit as possible and the means of achieving them must stand the test of relevance. If these concerns are addressed seriously, the Committee believes, all education stands to gain. If the purpose of various aspects of our educational system cannot be stated clearly, we had better recognize that fact and consider carefully its implications for our teacher education programs. Genuine commitment to a PBTE approach forces one to face up to the difficult tasks of goal determination and evaluation of outcomes; therein may lie its greatest value.

The logic of the performance-based approach also places a healthy stress on the use of evidence to test one's ideas and assumptions.* The feedback requirements generate a wealth of data which can be used not only to guide instruction, but also to give the learner insight into what is taking place; to check the efficacy of the instructional system as a whole; and to test relational hypotheses, adding to the body of knowledge available to teacher educators.

---

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Drummond in Appendix B-3.

At the same time, the Committee is also forced to recognize that the Achilles heel of PBTE may be that, while sound in theory, it may be so difficult in practice that its promise will never be attained in significant degree. The Committee has observed what it believes to be three major weaknesses in the application of the performance-based rationale to American teacher education:*

1. A tendency to move too quickly on too large a scale without adequate preparation and resources, and hence to achieve superficial results; and a corresponding compulsion to "try to do everything" by a performance-based approach, including attainment of objectives which, at the time, its advocates are not prepared to state in assessable terms;
2. A tendency to adopt too eclectic an approach, identifying numerous unrelated competencies without a guiding conceptualization of the teacher's role, resulting in a badly fragmented view of the teaching task;
3. A counter tendency to make too narrow an interpretation of PBTE unduly restricting its application as though its rationale were pertinent only to limited aspects of teacher education, i.e.:

    - to preservice preparation, neglecting in-service preparation;
    - to classroom teacher preparation, overlooking other personnel;
    - to professional education, ignoring applications in liberal arts;
    - to skills, excluding concepts and attitudes;
    - to lower levels of cognitive behaviors, omitting higher levels;
    - to cognitive outcomes only, avoiding affective considerations; and in general, to relatively simple, easily measured outcomes to the exclusion of complex performances.

In the Committee's opinion, PBTE has implications for programs for all types of educational personnel, from initial selection through full career development. This is not to say that any given institution should be expected to mount the full-blown panoply but that the fundamental concepts should be recognized as widely applicable.

Given the foregoing conceptions and convictions about PBTE, the Committee offers in the next chapter a series of recommendations for improvements in practice.

---

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Krathwohl in Appendix B-4.

Chapter III
OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Disclaimer: These are miscellaneous observations and recommendations representing the subjective judgment of the Committee concerning opinions expressed by its members. It is not the result of a systematic survey or analysis of any kind. The Committee is under no illusion that any higher body has blessed its words as "truth." It recognizes also that other groups have made similar recommendations and that much good work has been done throughout the country in most of the topics covered. These recommendations simply speak to certain aspects of the future of PBTE to the best of the Committee's ability.

The 10 topics have been grouped under three categories:

A. Program Considerations-- focus on the teaching-learning process, on the instructional program for prospective teachers or teachers-in-service

1. Role Definition
2. Development, Validation and Dissemination of Materials
3. Role of the Student in the Instructional Process
4. Assessment

B. Administrative Considerations--focus on factors facilitating the instructional program

5. Collaborative Decision Making
6. Management
7. Costs and Funding
8. Mandating
9. Accreditation and Program Approval

C. Research Considerations--focus on building the knowledge base, on the accumulation of professional knowledge

10. Research Design

Program Considerations

Topic 1 - Role Definition

This topic might have been referred to as "Identification of Competencies" or "Establishment of Performance Goals." It deals with deciding what ultimate outcomes the teacher education program is to be designed to produce. The essential characteristics definition in Chapter II indicates that such decisions are to be based on systematic analysis of the performance desired as end product (usually that of recognized practitioners)--the performance required to meet the goals of the schools in which the teacher will teach. The term "role definition" was used to stress the point that it is ultimately to the performance expected of the teacher on the job that those responsible for teacher education should look in order to establish the basic parameters of their programs.

> *Recommendation No. 1 - A clear description of the roles of the professional to be prepared should be in hand before the instructional program as such is formulated.*

It is axiomatic that the design of PBTE programs should be based on a clear-cut conceptualization of the roles it is assumed the teacher should fulfill. Such conceptualization will largely determine the program. For example, the teacher envisioned solely as a source of factual knowledge will need different preparation (with different allocation of resources) from the teacher conceived also as a person utilizing knowledge to design environments to develop each student's self-confidence and problem-solving ability. The point to this recommendation is that this conceptualization should be explicitly stated and should provide a unifying principle for the planning of the instructional program.

Since traditional programs have not always been based on clear-cut conceptualization and too many current performance-based programs represent merely a reshuffling of existing programs, obviously, many persons moving toward competency education have not recognized this necessity.

More than one conceptualization may, of course, be utilized by an agency if it has the resources to offer the varied learning opportunities called for. No one model of the professional educator has been validated as the "best." Such variations should directly assist those concerned with furthering our understanding of teaching and learning through presenting competing models for needed research and development.

> *Recommendation No. 2 - Agencies fostering PBTE should provide for the development of several sample lists of generic competencies for widely utilized teaching positions.*

The competencies desired in certain types of teachers must be determined by each group establishing a PBTE program. Such a task is often frustrating. Since even teachers preparing for different assignments undoubtedly have many common needs, there is little point in each group's starting anew. Yet there is obvious reluctance on the part of any official group to publish a list of general or common competencies, lest it be taken as prescriptive. But if several good such lists were produced, they might be extremely helpful by providing differing points of view which could serve as starting points for those initiating PBTE programs.

Similarly useful would be a discussion of how far such lists can profitably be utilized in view of the unique skills and personality configuration of each teacher which must be welded into a workable and successful teaching style.

Recommendation No. 3 - There should be a published exchange of views among "the best minds in the field" to explore the feasibility of requiring the same competencies of all teachers or of defined groups of teachers with similar responsibilities.

Such publication should make explicit the rationale and values underlying different views on this topic to aid those preparing programs to make informed choices.

Topic 2 - Development, Validation, and Dissemination of Instructional Materials

Recommendation No. 4 - Criteria which could serve as the basis for guiding developers and reviewers of instructional materials should be established and published in much the same way as was done for programmed instructional materials.

The Committee believes standards should be established for PBTE program materials. As would be expected, textbooks and supplementary materials designed for courses covering a semester or full academic year are often unsuitable for the shorter instructional units commonly found in PBTE programs. There is great demand for self-pacing instructional materials the student can use largely on his own. Unfortunately, a great deal of the material which has come to the attention of the Committee is poorly conceived, technically deficient, superficial, and shoddy.

Some years ago standards for programmed material were prepared by a joint committee of the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, the Society for Programmed Instruction, and the Division of Audio-Visual Instruction of the National Education Association. Such a joint venture by interested organizations is again in order. Indeed it might well be that many of the standards which were established for programmed instruction materials would apply, with minor modification, to materials for performance-based education.

Recommendation No. 5 - A formal review procedure should be established which would indicate the general quality and the strengths and weaknesses of available instructional materials.

The review editor would need to solicit unfinished materials on a very selective and judicious basis since authors are generally reluctant to submit unfinished materials for published review. However, if this could be done for materials that show promise, it might help to speed up the dissemination and widespread use of the materials.

The reviews should evaluate the materials as parts of an instructional system, indicating what can be carried by self-instruction and what must be accomplished by other means. They should indicate both strengths and weaknesses, encouraging creativity and variety. As weaknesses in the instructional development process are identified, appropriate research to overcome the difficulties could be undertaken.

Although the initial thrust under the rubric of PBTE has been in professional education, the basic point of view is applicable to other fields involved in the education of teachers and has in fact been spreading into the arts and sciences as well as other fields. As a matter of fact, a number of academic fields, notably the performing arts and some of the vocational fields, have long been performance-oriented and have guided their instructional efforts by the basic principles underlying PBTE without reference to the specific terminology which has recently come into use. It is the conviction of the present Committee that additional aspects of arts and science instruction, for example, the social sciences, would, if subjected to rigorous analysis, lend themselves to the application of these concepts. Therefore, just as information on the availability and characteristics of instructional materials for the professional education components of teacher education programs would facilitate the development of PBTE, so would similar information concerning materials for arts and sciences instruction enhance that part of the program.

Better provisions should be made, also, for exchange of materials. Too many people are busy reinventing the wheel; numerous committees all over the country are developing modules "from scratch," often on the same topics. There must be hundreds of such units, for example, on "how to write behavioral objectives." Needless to say they vary greatly in quality.

> *Recommendation No. 6 - Special funds should be made available to build interinstitutional arrangements for the exchange of instructional materials, including the establishment of resource banks on a regional basis.*

The shortage of available instructional material can be traced to other factors besides lack of adequate resources and inadequate exchange methods. Private publishing firms find it hard to think of marketing intact instructional packages with all their parts, pieces, and combinations of consumable and non-consumable materials. Authors are reluctant to share materials without some protection of their interests comparable to the copyright and royalty arrangements pertinent to the writing of books.

> *Recommendation No. 7 - A joint commission of teacher educators and publishers should analyze the problem of producing suitable instructional materials and conduct market research studies to determine whether commercial development of specialized instructional materials for PBTE programs is feasible.*

Such an analysis should be designed to produce recommendations to bring about a freer exchange of materials, to provide incentives for the preparation of high quality materials, and to determine the realistic bounds of student and instructional budgets for such items.

If commercial development is not feasible, franchising an institution to use, adapt, and reproduce materials locally might offer a possibility. Or a teacher education organization might enter the market if commercial profitability is not assured, acting as middleman between developers and users to provide franchising options or to reproduce materials on a cost basis for whatever demand exists.

Topic 3 - Role of the Student in the Instructional Process

It is difficult to keep referents straight when alluding to "teachers" and "students" in this discussion. The "student" referred to in this section is the prospective teacher or the teacher-in-service participating in a teacher education program.

As brought out in Chapter II, when one is concerned not merely with performance-based instruction but with application of performance-based instructional principles to teacher education in America, far reaching implications enter the picture. They are based on value considerations involved in the assumptions concerning the nature of the educational system and the role the teacher is to play in it. The commitment to the concept of the teacher as a professional operating in a school system requires that the student learn to design as well as direct instructional activities--that he learn to make choices among instructional alternatives. Furthermore, such teaching is a highly personal activity. What the professional teacher *is* as a person often has more influence on instructional results than the formal instructional techniques he uses. Consequently, the obligation to focus on the ultimate performance as a guiding consideration in conceptualizing the teacher's role leads to two recommendations regarding the part the teacher should play as student in the instructional program designed to develop and increase his professional competence.

> *Recommendation No. 8 - PBTE programs should be organized in a manner which will enable students to manage their own learning experiences within the limits of the program's objectives, including the selection of learning activities, reception of systematic feedback on progress, and provision for modifying programs on the basis of experience.*

> *Recommendation No. 9 - Programs should help students find teaching roles congruent with the skills and competencies they possess (or are able to acquire) and each student's unique value system, recognizing limits imposed by the fact that ultimately each one must assume a responsible professional role.*

This latter recommendation is essentially a plea for recognition of the significance of assisting each individual to work out his own personal style of teaching. It is important to recognize, also, that, as one moves through a career, his interests and competencies may change. One essential requirement of teacher education conceived essentially as a comprehensive staff development program is that it helps match the evolving needs of the schools with the aspirations and talents of the individual members of the teaching staff. Self-paced and self-sequenced learning, accommodation to the student's unique learning style, and cultivation of the close relationships developing where much of the interaction is on a one-to-one or small group basis may be used to personalize programs and to stimulate the student's creativity.

Topic 4 - Assessment*

Assessment lies at the heart of PBTE. Goals of instruction must be stated in assessable terms; learner performance must be assessed and reassessed throughout the instructional process; evidence so obtained must be used to evaluate the accomplishments of the learner and the efficacy of the system. Remove assessment from PBTE and all that is left is an enumeration of goals and provision of instruction which hopefully will lead to their attainment--not much on which to pin one's hopes for significant improvement in an educational program.

But assessment is both inherently difficult and inherently threatening. Such is the nature of evidence-gathering, whether it be in law enforcement, the hard sciences, or teacher education. The search for evidence has to meet rigorous tests of impartiality, objectivity, relevance, consistency, comprehensiveness. It always poses a threat to the status quo. Consequently, it should probably not come as any great surprise that the Committee has found little hard evidence to confirm or deny the claims of the proponents of PBTE or the counter-claims of its detractors. In most efforts to launch PBTE programs observed by Committee members, assessment has been neglected or attempted in piecemeal fashion, sometimes apparently as an afterthought. Seldom has it been carried on with sufficient rigor to test the basic hypotheses underlying the PBTE approach.

There are four major applications of assessment theory and skill in performance-based teacher education:

1. in initially *defining* competencies (performance goals),
2. in measuring candidates' attainment of those competencies,
3. in evaluating the effectiveness of educational procedures and materials,
4. in validating competencies (performance goals).

With respect to the definition of competencies (1 above), the requirement that specified competencies be "stated in advance of instruction in terms which make it possible to determine through assessment of learner performance the extent to which the competency has been attained" may look innocent, but it calls for a high degree of sophistication with respect to evaluation. It forces the instructor to face the question as to just what evidence would be convincing with respect to the attainment of his instructional goals. He must ask himself how he can, in the practical situation, obtain such evidence. Vague, general, fuzzy goals will not stand up under such analysis; the instructor puts himself under strong pressure to become increasingly precise in laying out just what he seeks to accomplish. The assessment problem becomes even more difficult when the personal choices of the learner are taken into consideration in establishing instructional goals. The student as well as the instructor must then face such questions.

---

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Drummond in Appendix B-3.

Assessing the attainment of competencies by specific candidates (required for 2 and 3 above) may involve a wide range of sophistication in measurement, from the relatively simple task of measuring the ability of the candidate to describe (orally or in writing) the requisite professional behavior, through evaluation of his personal performance in simulated or realistic situations, on to measurement of long-term effects on pupils resulting from the candidate's performance. Present attempts to relate a candidate's performance to long-term effects on pupils are both encouraging and disturbing; encouraging, because the research that needs to be done to establish accurately what factors do influence pupils has begun; disturbing, because some states, school districts, and colleges are developing policy positions and programs on the mistaken notion that conclusive evidence already exists.

With respect to the evaluation of the efficiency of instructional procedures and materials, such criteria as the following, in addition to mastery itself, should be considered:

1. time required by learners to master the competencies;
2. costs of instruction, including materials;
3. attitudes of learners toward procedures and materials; and
4. retention of mastery over time.

The ultimate validation of performance goals (Does specified teacher performance in fact bring about desired pupil performance?) is essentially a research task, but the more it can be built into ongoing teacher education programs the sooner we will accumulate the knowledge base we need. Thus, it is hoped that institutions with the necessary resources will so structure their experimental efforts.

> *Recommendation No. 10 - Any effort to develop a performance-based teacher education program should place major emphasis on developing and applying appropriate techniques of assessment. In recognition of the cruciality of this process and its inherent complexity, collaborative arrangements should be established between agencies interested in the development of performance-based programs and agencies employing persons skilled in assessment to make the expertise of the latter readily available in the development process.*

More concretely, such agencies as the United States Office of Education, various state departments of education, and the major foundations who underwrite performance-based programs should assist teacher education institutions and school districts to make use of expert measurement personnel on the staffs of major universities, the regional labs, the Educational Testing Service, and private institutes and corporations. In fact, they would be wise to make grants only when assured of the involvement of such personnel.*

---

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Krathwohl in Appendix B-4.

It is the Committee's judgment that many local groups trying to cast all or part of their teacher education efforts into a performance-based mold have their priorities mixed. Because they do not grasp the full significance of evaluation or because they undertake program development with inadequate resources, and no doubt partially because evaluation is difficult and threatening, most programs put a disproportionate amount of available time and energy into development of instructional materials and program management and invest much too little in assessment.

> *Recommendation No. 11 - The development of a plan for assessing the ongoing program (to assure that present student needs are being met and to provide data for the revision of the program for the next group of students) should be completed before any program is considered fully operational.*

In this connection, the Committee recognizes that the evaluation system in any new program is likely to represent simply a first approximation; it will be expected to evolve through incremental improvements. But before the program is launched, there should at least be a basic rationale, a recognized commitment to assessment, agreement on initial sets of materials and techniques to be used, and provision for suitable record keeping. In short, those in charge of the program should know how they will manage the evaluation process. As the program develops, these instruments, techniques, and procedures should be sharpened, and budgetary and staff arrangements should be effected to make possible studies relating evidence obtained to the variables in the program judged to be most significant.

Administrative Considerations

Topic 5 - Collaborative Decision Making

> *Recommendation No. 12 - PBTE programs should generally be undertaken on a collaborative basis involving significant roles in governance and planning by representatives of colleges and universities, school districts, the organized teaching profession, students in teacher education programs, and the general public. Since no single model has proved to be most efficacious, at this stage of development a variety of approaches to collaboration should be encouraged.*

There are both practical and theoretical reasons why each of these groups should be included. The colleges and universities have historically been the teacher educators; they are the recognized sources of advanced knowledge and research competence. Since in PBTE much of the instruction and most of the ultimate assessment must take place in the schools where the practitioners practice and where the most realistic clinical situations are to be found, school districts must be recognized increasingly as having a teacher education function. The staff development thrust (implicit in the Committee's conception of PBTE) places the school and the teacher at the heart of the movement. The conceptualization of the teacher as a professional which permeates the Committee's vision of PBTE requires that the professionals have a strong voice in their continuing preparation and in the processes through which new blood enters the profession. And the

authenic channels for the professional views are the independent professional organizations: the general associations representing the organized teaching profession and the more specialized groups of teachers from specific disciplinary and functional categories. The same basic logic which assigns to the student in the teacher education program a significant role in the planning of his own instruction, as outlined in the treatment of Topic 3, Role of the Student, argues for inclusion of such students in the broad planning of teacher education programs. The stake of the public is obvious; though, in all honesty, it must be recognized that representatives of the general public are most often left out of current arrangements for collaboration.

It goes without saying that the colleges and universities are being asked to share power and influence with schools and teachers. The moves already made in many teacher education programs to enhance vitality and realism by forming partnership arrangements between schools and colleges are being extended as these institutions consider PBTE. And both colleges and schools are being forced to accord the organized profession a much higher status and a greater degree of recognition and power in guiding its own destiny (especially with respect to field-based and in-service programs) than has been traditional in this country. The trends in this direction are clearly discernible and probably irreversible; PBTE did not bring them about, but its advocates recognize, applaud, and encourage them.

A growing problem in joint or collaborative endeavors is the confusion about the nature of problematical situations which seem always to be faced whenever independent (sovereign) organizations try to work together. In some situations, just because of the nature of the case, one party wins and the other parties lose. In such circumstances, adversary relationships are appropriate and negotiations strategies are as good as any known. In some collaborative situations, all parties may win; the endeavor benefits all organizations in some way or in some degree. In other situations, parties to the endeavor may not know beforehand what "the game" will be. It has become clear, however, that institutions and organizations involved in collaborative activity save much time and emotional energy if they sort out the elements which require negotiation (those which require agreed upon compromises for a fixed time period or until specified conditions change) from those which only require cooperation.

Joint sponsorship of PBTE programs and collaboration in broad planning does not require or imply parity in decision making throughout all aspects of programs. Most operational activities and decisions should be delegated to the organization or agency best suited to carry out the work. It is important in collaborative efforts, however, that responsibilities be clearly assigned and that candid feed-back be provided to the participating organizations and agencies.

Topic 6 - Management

An operation as complex as PBTE, involving extensive collaboration and individualization of instruction, is bound to pose challenging management problems. The Committee wishes to call attention to two "musts": clear delineation of responsibilities among collaborators and recognition of the importance of staff training.

Recommendation No. 13 - Responsibility for day-to-day management of the logistics of a PBTE program should be clearly delineated.

The simple problem of "who" is responsible for "what" can be overwhelming in a PBTE program developed on a collaborative basis and featuring highly individualized instruction. As one writer has put it, a program that is not neatly time-based, that has, for example, 30 required competencies and 10 elective competencies to be chosen from a possible 50, that has 200 modules related to those competencies, that provides a pretest and a posttest for each module and each competency, that has a significant proportion of its activities in the public schools, that provides feedback to each student (the list could go on with reference to minicourses, video-taping, sensivity sessions, field experiences, etc.) has created management problems much more complex than those in a traditional program. Record-keeping can become a nightmare, particularly if a formal research component is built into the program, as is highly desirable.

The usual solution to this problem entails provision of considerable lead time for planning (six months or a year perhaps) and restriction of initial efforts to pilot programs with a limited number of students.

The Committee has observed also that PBTE programs often suffer from the unrealistic assumption on the part of top administrators that staff members with traditional preparation and experiences may reasonably be expected to step right in and assume new duties without special preparation.

Recommendation No. 14 - Institutions and agencies considering PBTE should recognize that launching such a program will probably require careful attention to both initial and continuing preparation of staff.

An appropriate initial step is to make an inventory of the present and potential abilities of current staff members in the collaborating colleges and schools with respect to such professional tasks as: (a) conceptualizing the program as a whole and the instructional system, (b) identifying and defining competencies (performance goals), (c) choosing and/or developing and testing new instructional materials, (d) choosing and/or developing and validating assessment instruments and techniques, (e) providing individualized and small group instruction, (f) managing the logistics, keeping the records, and (g) using the accumulated data to test hypotheses.

Formal staff development activities such as seminars, visits, and use of consultants are then in order to fill the gaps in the inventory, enabling the staff to prepare itself for its new responsibilities. In some instances, new personnel with special expertise may have to be added at least on a temporary basis. It is a conviction of this Committee that educators have

generally been insensitive, even in traditional programs, to the fact that every personnel change or assignment of new responsibility poses a potential staff development problem--and opportunity. Having invested significantly in staff development, it would of course be wasteful not to provide conditions reasonably conducive to effective utilization of newly developed insights and skills. This means at the very least changes in staff assignments and the reward system. The Committee has observed that staff members in experimental programs tend to be saddled with unusually heavy demands on their time which suggests the wisdom of providing periodic breaks in the normal routine of program operation to give such faculty a chance to "recharge their batteries" and broaden their perspectives. Another aspect of management responsibility in PBTE is often overlooked: the heightened role of the student in the teacher education program as manager of his own learning program. This matter deserves more attention than it is generally given (see Topic 3 - Role of the Student). It remains on the agenda of "unfinished business."

Topic 7 - Costs and Funding

Recommendation No. 15 - Studies should be made to identify costs of launching PBTE programs and the principal factors which affect them.

A pressing need exists for reliable information on costs of PBTE programs. Educational policy makers and administrators are understandably apprehensive about making commitments when the cost of those commitments is not clear. Although it is generally assumed that PBTE involves costs not usually found in teacher education programs, adequate cost analyses are not available.

It is clear that costs are two types: developmental and operational.

Developmental Costs. These are "start-up" costs to provide preparatory training for personnel and to provide them time to define competencies, assemble and develop instructional materials and assessment techniques, and work out procedures and devices for monitoring and managing the program. Such costs must usually be met from additional funds beyond the ordinary operating budgets. They can, of course, be kept minimal by starting new programs on a small scale.

Operational Costs. It is generally recognized that PBTE has the following operational requirements which go beyond those of traditional teacher education programs: more extensive instructional materials and equipment, more elaborate assessment procedures, and more extensive record keeping. Of particular importance is released time for school personnel supervising clinical experience. There may be offsetting savings through greater use of self-instructional materials, independent study and unsupervised group work, the elimination of many typical classes, and the reallocation of staff resources. The net effect on costs were PBTE programs to be widely adopted has not been determined. In general, individualized clinical education may be expected to be more expensive than mass education, but making the student significantly more responsible for his own education might have surprising results.

*Recommendation No. 16 - Special funds should be provided for the developmental phase of PBTE by those budgeting for teacher education at the local, state, and federal levels. Funding agencies, in particular the U. S. Office of Education and large foundations, should provide continuing support for at least five more years.**

The Office of Education has provided funds for PBTE through a variety of its programs, most notably the Elementary Education Models and the Teacher Corps, and through the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (NCIES). But the accepted role of the federal government in helping to meet emergency situations and in stimulating innovation rather than in sustaining generally accepted programs has historically led to short-run commitments and kaleidoscopic changes in program emphasis. It would be par for the course if significant support were to be withdrawn in a year or two. Hence, the Committee wishes to stress its belief that PBTE will never reach its potential if significant developmental funds are not made available on a continuing basis, particularly for improvements in assessment. Support is most crucial at the point where change is imminent or has just begun. The entire thrust of the ideas developed during the last few years may be lost if those attempting to promote improvement through PBTE find outside funding withdrawn at the point where it is needed most.

Fortunately, some states such as Florida and Texas have already committed resources to further this effort. And the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation has awarded the Educational Testing Service a planning grant to develop a national commission on performance-based education. This initial grant may lead to large scale multi-agency funding, an event of major significance.

Topic 8 - Mandating

During the last year or so, members of the Committee have with increasing frequency expressed deep concern over what they considered to be precipitate action by some state legislatures requiring the development of performance-based teacher education and certification programs without provision for the necessary lead time, professional discussion, in-service training, and financial support for research and development to assure good results. Under these conditions, they have felt, superficial compliance, with a strong negative reaction to the new principles and programs forced upon teachers and teacher educators, is the most likely outcome. The potentialities of PBTE may well be jeopardized by premature action of this kind. These Committee members realize the advantages of concerted action, but feel that at this stage of development such action is more likely to be successful if undertaken on the basis of decisions by relatively small organizational units where consensus is reached on a face-to-face basis.

---

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Daly in Appendix B-2.

Consequently, in June 1973, the Committee, with the endorsement of the Board of Directors of AACTE, issued a statement[8] expressing its belief that PBTE "has tremendous potential for the improvement of instruction both at the college and the public school level," calling attention to unresolved issues and problems, and urging that states adopt an experimental rather than a mandatory approach to PBTE. Particularly, the Committee offered the following recommendations:

1. Because performance-based teacher education appears to have high potential for generating significant improvements in teacher education, its potential should not be compromised or jeopardized by undue pressure or haste.
2. Because performance-based teacher education appears to have high potential for generating significant improvements in teacher education, state authorities should study, encourage experimentation, and fund PBTE developmental activities.
3. Because the present level of knowledge about performance-based teacher education is limited, states are advised to avoid legislation which prescribes or proscribes PBTE. State education agencies are encouraged to maintain a flexible and open position regarding performance-based teacher education and performance-based teacher certification until sufficient knowledge about PBTE has been generated through experience and research.[8]

Reaction to the foregoing statement has generally been favorable. Officials in a significant number of states have expressed appreciation for the advice, which they felt to be pertinent and timely. The Committee realizes that conditions vary greatly from state to state; it doesn't wish to put a damper on enthusiastic action where the conditions are ripe. Hence, it offers the following summary recommendation on this matter:

> *Recommendation No. 17 - State authorities should vigorously encourage experimentation with PBTE by fostering widespread discussion and funding developmental efforts and research, but prior to the development of a strong supporting consensus among those who will have to put the program into operation, they should not take legislative or administrative action mandating any single approach to teacher education. If state authorities do mandate some actions in support of PBTE on the basis of evidence that the necessary groundwork has been laid and they have the backing of the profession in taking steps toward PBTE on a state-wide basis, they should maintain a flexible, open position allowing for widespread experimentation, continuous feedback and adjustment in requirements and deadlines.**

---

[8]"Implementing Performance-Based Teacher Education at the State Level." (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, June 1973), page 3.

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Smith in Appendix B-1.

Mandatory action by local school districts and colleges or universities may likewise have unfavorable results. The Committee has observed with dismay teachers and professors hastily listing "competencies," concocting cut-and-paste syllabi, assembling assorted materials, and throwing together examination items in order to comply with local edicts that all instruction in a certain phase of the program "be performance-based by the opening of the fall semester."

*Recommendation No. 18 - Authorities in institutions and school districts should not mandate performance-based teacher education without ascertaining in advance that conditions required for implementation, including the commitment of the professional personnel who must put the program into operation, exist or can be brought into place.**

Topic 9 - Accreditation and Program Approval

The implementation of PBTE should not be slowed by inflexible educational standards developed in terms of conventional programs. More specifically, standards should recognize new conditions and allow freedom for new approaches with respect to collaborative decision-making, staff deployment, materials, records, and the rôle of the student in influencing his program of instruction. But there is still need for standards; in fact, the need is probably enhanced by the call for experimentation. Experimentation can be ill-conceived, superficial, misinterpreted, disorganized, and inadequately prepared for and supported. So, the focus of the accreditation or approval process may shift in part from the characteristics of the teacher education program itself to the quality of the experimental process.

Recommendation No. 19 - National and state standards for accreditation of teacher education institutions and approval of teacher education programs should give positive encouragement to experimentation with PBTE and hold institutions to reasonably rigorous standards regarding the quality of such experimental efforts.

In the meantime, the accreditation process goes on. The Committee believes that current NCATE standards have in effect anticipated many of the basic ideas lying behind the PBTE movement and that more vigorous application of these aspects of current standards is in order.

Recommendation No. 20 - NCATE should apply more rigorously the present national standards which incorporate basic ideas of the PBTE strategy: specification of explicit program objectives; design of programs in relation to role conceptualization; program review, evaluation, feedback, and revision; and the evaluation of graduates.

---

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Smith in Appendix B-1.

Research Considerations

Topic 10 - Research Design

Observed in broad perspective, PBTE is seen to be a problem-solving approach--an application of the scientific method (crudely no doubt in many instances) to the practical task of preparing teachers. It is an approach which treats results achieved as *evidence* to be utilized in improving the teacher education process.

The advent of PBTE thus offers an opportunity for significant research because

1. increased precision in defining goals, identifying assumptions, and measuring outcomes greatly improves the conditions for analyzing cause and effect relationships within teacher preparation program, and
2. the possibility of having groups of teachers with more clearly identified constellations of abilities enhances the probability that relationships between teacher preparation and pupil outcomes can be fruitfully studied.

Since the profession needs a greatly expanded body of knowledge of such relationships, it is imperative that research be carried on, that findings be disseminated, and that the implications of such analysis be incorporated into the development of improved teacher education programs--a bootstraps operation.

> *Recommendation No. 21 - A research design should be an integral element in the development of all PBTE programs.*

In endorsing the above recommendation the Committee is expressing its conviction that PBTE programs should be conceived on the basis of stated hypotheses, evidence should be sought by which to test those hypotheses, records should be carefully kept and subjected to rigorous analysis and, ideally, results should be published in sufficient detail to replicate studies. The Committee realizes, of course, that there will be great variation in the degree of sophistication with which various institutions and agencies can mount such programs. It wishes to stress here that all experimenters should recognize an obligation to meet such criteria as best they can, that funding agencies should assist a reasonable number of programs to do a thoroughly competent job, and that the large research-oriented universities have a special obligation and opportunity in this respect.

Two additional comments:

1. In experimental programs which permit students to participate on a voluntary basis, careful controls should be exercised to identify any peculiar characteristics of those who volunteer and to separate as much as possible the effects of self-selection from the effects of training.
2. One of the more hopeful aspects of the PBTE movement is that it may focus attention on a *search for evidence* as a substitute for the petty power struggles which are inevitable in the absence of a firm knowledge base undergirding professional practice.

Chapter IV
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This publication has sought to give direction to the performance-based (or, as some prefer, competency-based) approach to teacher education by clarifying key concepts, highlighting potentialities and pitfalls, and making a series of specific recommendations to those engaged in this effort.

The Committee views the PBTE movement as deeply rooted in the historic development of American teacher education--as a promising current response to the persistent problem of keeping the preparation of teachers, under rapidly changing social conditions, effectively related to the job they are expected to do in the schools. It is thus seen to have numerous antecedents in its call for greater rigor and realism in defining goals for teacher education and in determining the extent to which such goals are achieved.

PBTE is in essence the application of a formal system for designing and managing instruction to the task of educating teachers for American schools. Some of its characteristics are inherent in the system for design and management; some stem from the nature of the schools.

Any instructional program is considered to be performance-based if (a) instructional goals are derived from analysis of practitioner performance and are stated in advance in assessable terms and (b) evidence obtained through assessment of learner performance is used to guide individual instruction, to determine individual progress, and to evaluate the system. The formula is deceptively simple but demanding: careful definition of performance goals in assessable terms and guidance of instruction by evaluation of learner performance. The emphasis on realism and rigor implies a systemic program of individualized instruction, with emphasis on feedback and demonstrated competence to determine pacing and completion of instruction.

When the system is applied to the preparation of teachers for American schools, important value considerations arise--principally the assumptions that: (a) teachers are to be prepared and to keep themselves up to date as professionals in command of a growing body of professional knowledge and (b) they are to work in schools where democratic values are paramount. The fact that the teacher is assumed to be a designer of instruction as well as an instructor and that he is to diagnose and prescribe treatment as do other professionals implies recognition of a special role for the student in the teacher education program and the inclusion of alternatives and options from which he may choose. It means also that the design of teacher education programs on the basis of formally stated hypotheses with evidence gathering and record keeping systems to facilitate the testing of such hypotheses--a research approach--is of key importance in building the knowledge base which is the hallmark of a recognized profession. The Committee recognizes, however, that not all aspects of a program need be performance-based, insisting only that such aspects be consciously designed and properly labelled.

In passing, the Committee notes that it has retained the use of the term "performance-based" rather than "competency-based" primarily for reasons of convenience. It believes that either term implies the other--that all proponents of the movement are speaking of "competent performance" regardless of which term they use.

The unique strength of PBTE is that it challenges all who touch it to be open about their intentions and explicit about how they will decide if their hopes are fulfilled. Ends must be made explicit; means must stand the test of relevance. The logic of the performance-based approach places a healthy stress on the use of evidence to test one's ideas and assumptions. In these considerations lie what the Committee believes to be its great potentialities.

At the same time, the Committee recognizes that, while sound in theory, PBTE may prove so difficult in practice that its accomplishments fall far short of its promise. Its major shortcomings to date are seen to be superficiality and fragmentation resulting from attempting too much with limited resources, adopting too eclectic an approach and making too narrow an interpretation of PBTE.

Nevertheless, on balance, the Committee believes the potentialities justify a large-scale effort and offers a series of recommendations (stated below in considerably abbreviated form) for improvements in practice.

Program Considerations

Topic 1 - Role Definition

1. Clear-cut conceptualization of the roles of the professional to be prepared should precede formulation of a PBTE instructional program.
2. Sample lists of generic competencies for widely utilized teaching positions should be prepared.
3. The feasibility of requiring the same competencies of all teachers with similar responsibilities should be discussed in the professional literature.

Topic 2 - Development, Validation, and Dissemination of Instructional Materials

4. Standards for assessing the quality of PBTE instructional materials should be developed.
5. Formal review procedures indicating the quality of materials when judged by such standards should be established.
6. Interinstitutional arrangements for exchange of materials, including regional resource banks, should be developed.
7. A joint commission of teacher educators and publishers should analyze publication problems and study the feasibility of commercial production in this area.

Topic 3 - The Role of the Student*

8. PBTE programs should provide students opportunities to manage their own learning experiences within the limits of the programs' objectives.
9. PBTE programs should help students find teaching roles and styles for which they are uniquely fitted.

---

*See statement of special concern by Committee member Drummond in Appendix B-3.

Topic 4 - Assessment

10. In recognition of the cruciality of the assessment process in PBTE and its inherent complexity, collaborative arrangements should be made to utilize the expertise of persons skilled in assessment.
11. Assessment plans should be completed before a PBTE program is considered fully operational.

Administrative Considerations

Topic 5 - Collaborative Decision Making

12. PBTE programs should try a variety of approaches to collaborative decision making, involving significant roles for representatives of colleges, school districts, organized teachers, students, and the general public.

Topic 6 - Management

13. Responsibility for day-to-day management of PBTE programs should be clearly delineated.
14. The vital importance of special preparation for staff members should be recognized in the launching of PBTE programs.

Topic 7 - Costs and Funding

15. Studies are needed to identify costs of PBTE programs and the principal factors which affect them.
16. The federal government and foundations should provide continuing support for PBTE for at least five more years.

Topic 8 - Mandating

17. State authorities should foster experimentation with PBTE but not mandate it unless there is a strong supporting consensus within the profession. If states do take action in support of PBTE, they should maintain flexible, open positions allowing for widespread experimentation, feedback, and program modification.
18. Authorities in institutions and school districts should not mandate PBTE without strong backing of the professional personnel who are to put the program into operation.

Topic 9 - Accreditation and Program Approval

19. Accreditation and approval standards should encourage PBTE experimentation and apply reasonably rigorous standards to the experimentation itself.
20. NCATE should apply more rigorously its present standards which incorporate basic elements of PBTE strategy.

Research Considerations

Topic 10 - Research Design

21. A research design should be an integral element in the development of all PBTE programs.

As this Committee concludes its work, it wishes to express the hope that its publications over the last three years have helped to clarify the definitional concepts and underlying assumptions of PBTE and repeats its conviction, as stated in the closing paragraph of its initial publication, that PBTE represents "a strong and viable movement, given intelligent leadership and adequate support for research to strengthen the thin knowledge base, particularly in the field of measurement, upon which it must rest."[9]

---

[9]Elam, op.cit., p.23.

Appendix A
"ESSENTIAL DEFINING CHARACTERISTICS OF PBTE"
AS VIEWED BY THE AACTE COMMITTEE

In the State of the Art Publication[10] December 1971	In This Publication February 1974
A teacher education program is performance-based if	
1. Competencies to be demonstrated by the student are	1. Competencies to be demonstrated by the student are
.derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles,	.derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles *in achieving school goals,*
	.*supported by research, curriculum and job analysis, and/or experienced teacher judgment,*
.stated so as to make possible assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies, and	.stated so as to make possible assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies, and
.made public in advance.	.made public in advance.
2. Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are	2. Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are
.based upon, and in harmony with, specified competencies,	.based upon, and in harmony with, specified competencies,
.explicit in stating expected levels of mastery under specified conditions, and	.explicit in stating expected levels of mastery under specified conditions, and
.made public in advance.	.made public in advance.
3. Assessment of the student's competency	4. Assessment of the student's competency
.uses his performance as a primary source of evidence,	.uses his performance as a primary source of evidence,
.takes into account evidence of the student's knowledge relevant to planning for, analyzing, interpreting, or evaluating situations or behavior, and	.takes into account evidence of the student's knowledge relevant to planning for, analyzing, interpreting, or evaluating situations or behavior,

[10]Elam, op.cit., pp.6-7.

.strives for objectivity.	.strives for objectivity, and .*facilitates future studies of the relation between instruction, competency attainment and achievement of school goals.*
4. The student's rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competency *rather than by time or course completion.*	5. The student's rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competency.
5. The instructional program is intended to facilitate the development and evaluation of the student's achievement of competencies specified.	3. The instructional program provides for the development and evaluation of the student's achievement of each of the competencies specified.

Note: Italics are used to cite differences in the two analyses.

COMMENTARY ON APPENDIX A TABLE

Only three changes merit explanation (the renumbering is simply to put the items in a somewhat more logical order).

1. The Committee believes the earlier statement did not stress sufficiently that the competencies are not just picked out of the air but are derived analytically and must be related to the basic objectives of the schools. Hence, the changes in #1.

2. The Committee has become convinced that the design of assessment procedures in PBTE programs should go beyond evaluation of individual student progress to facilitate to the greatest extent possible accumulation of knowledge concerning relationships between instruction, teacher performance and pupil outcomes. Hence, the added item #3 (new #4).

3. The Committee recognized that, while student progress should depend essentially on demonstrated competence, in practical situations some time limits may have to be placed on students. Hence, the omission of the last phrase in #4 (new #5).

Appendix B-1
STATEMENT OF SPECIAL CONCERN

Emmitt D. Smith*

Recommendations 17 and 18 are inappropriately written, reflect limited thought in the specific area of systemic educational development or change, and are inconsistent with the total text of the paper of which they are a part.

The paper is written positively and all recommendations except 17 and 18 are positive statements. Recommendations 17 and 18 are written negatively reflecting an excessive fear of the "establishment" on the part of some members of the Committee. Frowning upon appropriate and planned formalization procedures of legally constituted entities, such as states, seems short sighted when viewed from the perspective of systemic educational development or change. Finally, Recommendation 17 includes an implied inaccuracy when it refers to "any single approach to teacher education." This reference to PBTE as a *single approach* is not only inaccurate but inconsistent with the section of the total text under the heading, "Characteristics of PBTE Programs" where the all-encompassing characteristic of PBTE is well presented even pointing out in some detail that PBTE can accommodate any instructional task, any method or instructional technique. The tendency of the uninformed to refer to PBTE as "one method" or "one doctrine," will be encouraged by the present wording of Recommendation 17 even though this may not be the true implication.

In my opinion, Recommendations 17 and 18 should be written thus:

Recommendation 17 - State authorities should vigorously encourage experimentation with PBTE by fostering widespread discussion and funding developmental efforts and research, but, prior to the development of a strong supporting consensus among those who will have to put the program into operation, they should take legislative or administrative action mandating PBTE only when it becomes strategically advantageous. If state authorities do mandate some actions in support of PBTE on the basis of evidence that the necessary groundwork has been laid and they have the backing of the profession in taking steps toward PBTE on a state-wide basis, they should maintain a flexible, open position allowing for widespread experimentation, continuous feedback and adjustment in requirements and deadlines.

Recommendation 18 - Authorities in institutions and school districts should mandate performance-based teacher education only after ascertaining that conditions required for implementation, including the commitment of the professional personnel who must put the program into operation, exist or can be brought into place.

---

*Committee members Drummond, Ford, Jenkins, Killough, Krathwohl and Qualls also endorse this statement.

Appendix B-2
STATEMENT OF SPECIAL CONCERN

Patrick L. Daly*

The task of weaving a paper out of the divergent strands of thought represented in a committee such as the PBTE Committee of AACTE is obviously an arduous and demanding one. I believe that the finished paper does an admirable job of attempting to reflect degrees of consensus that were reached by the committee on a number of critical issues. Inevitably, however, if a paper is not to be just a *potpourri* of miscellaneous opinions it must give greater emphasis to some points than to others in order to have a coherance and integrity of its own.

One such emphasis that appears in this paper concerns the potential of PBTE. I feel that the paper conveys, in a number of ways, a degree of optimism about the potential of PBTE that I find increasingly difficult to share. During the past three or four years the production of material on PBTE has increased tremendously. Every member of the PBTE Committee has file cabinets crammed with a variety of PB related materials. In view of all that has been spent, is being spent, and undoubtedly will be spent on PBTE, it seems reasonable to conclude that some concrete evidence should begin to be offered that teachers trained under such programs are more effective than those trained by more traditional methods. The fact that no real evidence has been offered of this kind has been mentioned time and again by critics of the movement. I agree with this point made by the critics, but what I find even more disturbing is that there appears to be little evidence that the institutions and states who have climbed aboard the PB bandwagon are really prepared to devote the necessary amounts of time, effort and resources to determining if PBTE can, *in fact*, produce classroom teachers who possess superior skills, techniques and knowledge that will result in greater competence in the classroom.

In view of the reactions stated above I feel that I must dissent from Recommendation No. 16 that the U.S. Office of Education and private foundations "should provide continuing support for at least five more years" for the developmental stage of PBTE. As the PBTE Committee report makes clear, resources for development of PBTE programs have already been committed in Florida and Texas and, in addition, there is the possibility of the establishment of a National Commission on Performance-Based Education. In view of this on-going commitment in a number of areas, I believe it would be prudent to discourage the expansion and proliferation of PBTE programs until we have some feedback relating to the validity of the claims of PBTE supporters from those states where PB programs are actually in operation. I have come to the conclusion that something stronger than the reassurances of PBTE supporters is needed before recommendations should be made by the PBTE Committee that an additional five years of funding is necessary. If the Committee means what is says about mandating (and I believe that it does), then we should not be encouraging the means by which mandating becomes possible, namely, the allocation of greater amounts of funds. We should, instead, be encouraging a greater concentration upon assessment of PBTE programs that are presently in existence.

The Committee report, as indicated earlier, contains a number of statements which convey a strong sense of optimism about the potential of PBTE. On the first page of the preface, for example, one finds the following: "As the title suggests, the Committee believes that PBTE has potential for improving the education of teachers and other professional school personnel and offers these recommendations to assist in the realization." In the section on mandating, the following statement is made: "Because performance-based teacher education appears to have high potential for generating significant improvements in teacher education..." The total accumulation of such expressions causes one to ask on what rationale the Committee or as a member of that Committee base such hopeful expectations regarding the potential of PBTE. At present I do not believe such grounds exist and the attempts by the Committee to be positive, encouraging and fair to the PBTE movement have, I believe, led us inadvertently into making statements which express a greater degree of optimism about the potential for constructive change in the movement than is actually warranted at the present time.

---

*Committee members Drummond, Jenkins, and Qualls concur with this statement. Kennamer agrees but would not delete Recommendation 16.

Fulton says: "I am more optimistic than Daly about the potential of PBTE. My real concern has to do with the extent to which interested groups, particularly the organized classroom teachers, are involved in the development and operation of PBTE programs."

Maucker notes: "I agree with Daly on the need for evidence but I think this means that continued support by the federal government should be channeled to meet this need, not that support should be discontinued."

Krathwohl states: "I applaud Mr. Daly's forthrightness and agree with his points

1. Few institutions and states are prepared to pay the costs of bringing the kind of PBTE system on line that can provide the basis for determining the possible superiority of PBTE.
2. There must soon be some evidence that PBTE programs are, or are not, in at least some ways, an improvement over present programs.

My commitment, and that of at least some others on the Committee is *not* to spread PBTE across the land. Rather, as Mr. Daly suggests, it is to bring enough PBTE-type programs to some level of excellence that they truly reflect the variety of apparently inherent potential.

There is no one model of a PBTE program. Each program differs from others in important ways. Further, programs with some degree of sophistication are only now beginning to reach puberty, much less adolescence or maturity. The major concern behind Recommendation 16 is that a financial commitment to PBTE be maintained long enough by the sponsoring parties, and at sufficiently high levels, to bring at least reasonably close to maturity, the variety of model programs that are capable of representing the PBTE potential. Only then can we determine PBTE's superiority, if any.

Valencia notes: "I cannot endorse the majority of Daly's statements. The U.S. Office of Education and private foundations should continue to provide support. Additional exploration and experimentation is needed, especially in discussing competencies and modes of operation relative to multicultural environments. I do not believe we should either discourage or encourage expansion of PBTE; yet, we must continue to serve as an informational base. On the other hand, we may encourage further exploration and experimentation with features relative to PBTE. This is still needed."

Appendix B-3
COMMENTS ON ACHIEVING THE POTENTIAL OF PBTE

William H. Drummond*

Page 5 The timing of the PBTE movement is unfortunate on two counts: (1) In many peoples' minds PBTE is associated with the accountability movement -- a movement which by definition is concerned with cost effectiveness and "bare bones" operations. (2) The application of systems technology to human problems, a technology which calls for clearly defined objectives, has come on the scene just as many of the youth of America are questioning the usefulness of planning and/or the establishment of intermediate and long range goals. Some young intellectuals who are focusing on the here and now and non-cognitive explanations of reality find the PBTE press for definition to be tedious and unworthy of their time.

Page 5 A valid criticism of PBTE programs is that developers have not examined carefully the basic assumptions under which they are working. Their programs apparently have accepted the roles teachers are being asked to play presently rather than dealing with roles teachers *ought to play* in the future.

Page 6 I dislike the medical analogy. I hope most teachers are more sensitive to the dynamics of classroom life than my doctors seem to be about my health and welfare.

Page 7 A good human system does not have to have a completely clear view of the end product. A good system recognizes that man's knowledge is limited; that teaching is situation specific. The task, therefore, is to forecast goals as well as one can using the data which are available. Then, using science and current professional knowledge, institutions should forge ahead with programs which make each activity a learning enterprise for the institution, the staff and the students. This process used to be called action research.

Page 8 There is a danger that a system may become closed -- that is, it may become unable to change as conditions external to the system changes. Both a system and a scientific experiment tend to focus attention and energies exclusively on events which lie within the parameters of the problem or the system. PBTE programs may be vulnerable to this problem. PBTE programs probably should be shut down periodically to see if the operating goals and objectives are worthy -- whether the underlying assumptions are still appropriate in relation to the human condition and the problems of the world.

Page 9 If teaching is to be a profession, at some time the decisions about what is to happen in a teaching situation have to be made by the practicing professional in charge. The teacher education program, whether PB or not, needs to make clear (1) that decisions should be made on the basis of principle theory or verified knowledge, and (2) the time point when the new teacher has the decision-making responsibility should be made explicit. At some identifiable point in the program, the new teacher needs to be accepted as a full-fledged professional worker.

Page 10 #2 There needs to be more emphasis on the underlying rationale for the program: the assumptions undergirding the design, the foundations of education.

Page 11 It is important for the reader to remember that judgements about who gets into teaching are being made in every teacher education program now. The question of what evidence is being used to make judgements ought to be dealt with in any case.

Page 18 The assessment discussion still leaves me cold. Assessment is crucial to PBTE because it is a data-based system. Data are collected and used to make adjustments and changes in what and how things are done. Data are not collected for punitive reasons, that is, to "get" personnel. Unless assessment can be placed in a context of trust, PBTE cannot result in real improvement.

Page 29 #8 & 9 Apparently many of the PBTE critics view PBTE as a totally convergent enterprise. I don't see it that way. My experience with PBTE leads me to believe that programs, as they continue in time and as they adjust to the data they collect, will place more and more value on divergence. As we learn more about student-teacher relationships, more of the key characteristics which influence success will be screened for at entrance into teacher education. Preparation programs then will be able to deal with divergent interests and concerns almost exclusively. After all, if we want teachers to value and care for individual differences, shouldn't preparation programs promote caring behavior by example?

---

*Committee members Barr and Medley endorse the entire statement by Drummond. The following members concur with only those parts of Drummond's statement as indicated by page references:

Ford - 5, 6, 29

Jenkins - 29

Killough - 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 18, 29

Krathwohl - 5, 10, 29

Valencia - 6, 9, 11, 29

Valencia adds the following comments:

Page 7: "I believe that this point of view can be incorporated in PBTE programs."

Page 8: I would substitute for Bill's final sentence, "PBTE programs probably should be shut down..." the following - "PBTE programs must contain, within them, ongoing assessment mechanisms, as well as openness for modification wherever and whenever possible."

Appendix B-4
STATEMENT OF SPECIAL CONCERN

David R. Krathwohl*

Page 12 There is a fourth weakness which it is important to make very apparent, even though it is implied in some of the specifics attributed to the third. This is the weakness in the evaluation procedures currently used with PBTE. It is only if one has an adequate evaluation program that one can call a program performance based! One of the important distinguishing characteristics of PBTE is that the student is not given credit for simply having completed an instructional experience; he or she must *demonstrate* mastery of both content and associated behaviors. Yet programs claiming to be PBTE give this aspect short shrift. Current evaluation techniques tend to be limited, amateurish, or even sometimes omitted. In many instances they do not go beyond simply having the instructor sign off that a student has completed certain experiences. This is no advance over past procedures.

Page 19 To be performance based implies a kind of sophistication in evaluation which is considerably beyond the techniques which are currently being employed in operating programs. Perhaps it is not unreasonable that in the early developmental stages of PBTE the greatest share of energy should be devoted to the creation of the best possible instructional process. But it is going to take a prodigious effort to develop the kind of instrumentation which PBTE requires; and we must get started on it. In many instances the demands of PBTE lie beyond our present ability to deliver such instrumentation. This is particularly true of some of the affective objectives. We need to get experimentation started to develop those evaluation procedures. There, therefore, is needed an additional recommendation which calls specific attention to this problem, and which strengthens the statements made about evaluation later in the document, especially the first paragraph on page 19:

The evaluation of a student's mastery of skills and concepts is an essential part of PBTE, yet one that is currently not getting adequate attention. New grants for the development of PBTE should be given with the understanding that there will be as much emphasis placed on the development of the process of evaluation as is placed on the development of instructional materials. Further, there should be a marked increase in the support of experimental projects which attack some of the problems of PBTE evaluation where our present methodology is inadequate.

*Committee members Barr, Dodl, Drummond, Jenkins, Kennamer, Maucker, McCarty, and Valencia concur with this statement.

Medley also concurs with Krathwohl's statement and adds: "During the years that the Committee has been meeting we have heard over and over that active development of a research base for teacher education is probably the most acute need for the health of the PBTE movement, and that another need not far down the list is the related need for improving assessment procedures. I believe that the needed research will never be done unless it becomes an integral part of each program to collect, on a regular basis, data relating competencies (defined as enabling objectives) to teacher effectiveness in helping pupils to learn. To put it differently, what Barak Rosenshine calls 'process-product studies' need to become either a part of the routine follow-up studies of PBTE programs or a special element in them."

Rosner also supports the statement and adds: "It should be noted that The Report of the Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education (Task Force '72), 'The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education,' also identified the development of assessment procedures as the most significant and critical step in the design, establishment and maintenance of CBTE."

ABOUT AACTE

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is an organization of more than 860 colleges and universities joined together in a common interest: more effective ways of preparing educational personnel for our changing society. It is national in scope, institutional in structure, and voluntary. It has served teacher education for 55 years in professional tasks which no single institution, agency, organization, or enterprise can accomplish alone.

AACTE's members are located in every state of the nation and in Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Collectively, they prepare more than 90 percent of the teaching force that enters American schools each year.

The Association maintains its headquarters in the National Center for Higher Education, in Washington, D. C.--the nation's capital, which also in recent years has become an educational capital. This location enables AACTE to work closely with many professional organizations and government agencies concerned with teachers and their preparation.

In AACTE headquarters, a stable professional staff is in continuous interaction with other educators and with officials who influence education, both in immediate actions and future thrusts. Educators have come to rely upon the AACTE headquarters office for information, ideas, and other assistance and, in turn, to share their aspirations and needs. Such interaction alerts the staff and officers to current and emerging needs of society and of education and makes AACTE the center for teacher education. The professional staff is regularly out in the field--nationally and internationally--serving educators and keeping abreast of the "real world." The headquarters office staff implements the Association's objectives and programs, keeping them vital and valid.

Through conferences, study committees, commissions, task forces, publications, and projects, AACTE conducts a program relevant to the current needs of those concerned with better preparation programs for educational personnel. Major programmatic thrusts are carried out by commissions on international education, multicultural education, and accreditation standards. Other activities include government relations and a consultative service in teacher education.

A number of activities are carried on collaboratively. These include major fiscal support for and selection of higher education representatives on the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education--an activity sanctioned by the National Commission on Accrediting and a joint enterprise of higher education institutions represented by AACTE, organizations of school board members, classroom teachers, state fertification officers, and chief state school officers.

The Association headquarters provides several secretariat services which help make teacher education more interdisciplinary and comprehensive:

the Associated Organizations of Teacher Education and the International Council on Education for Teaching. A major interest in teacher education provides a common bond between AACTE and fraternal organizations.

AACTE is deeply concerned with and involved in the major education issues of the day. Combining the considerable resources inherent in the consortium--constituted through a national voluntary association--with strengths of others creates a synergism of exceptional productivity and potentiality. Serving as the nerve center and spokesman for major efforts to improve education personnel, the Association brings to its task credibility, built-in cooperation and communications, contributions in cash and kind, and diverse staff and membership capabilities.

AACTE provides a capability for energetically, imaginatively, and effectively moving the nation forward through better prepared educational personnel. From its administration of the pioneering educational television program, "Continental Classroom," to its involvement of 20,000 practitioners, researchers, and decision makers in developing the current *Recommended Standards for Teacher Education,* to many other activities, AACTE has demonsrated its organizational and consortium qualification and experiences in conceptualizing, studying and experimenting, communicating, and implementing diverse thrusts for carrying out socially and educationally significant activities. With the past as prologue, AACTE is proud of its history and confident of its future among the "movers and doers" seeking continuous renewal of national aspirations and accomplishments through education.

ABOUT THE TEXAS TEACHER CENTER PROJECT

The AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education serves as the national component of the Texas Teacher Center Project. This Project was initiated in July, 1970, through a grant to the Texas Education Agency from the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, USOE. The Project was initially funded under the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program and the national component was subcontracted by the Texas Education Agency to AACTE.

One of the original thrusts of the Texas Teacher Center Project was to conceptualize and field test performance-based teacher education programs in pilot situations and contribute to a statewide effort to move teacher certification to a performance base. By the inclusion of the national component in the Project, the Texas Project made it possible for all efforts in the nation related to performance-based teacher education to gain national visibility. More important, it gave to the nation a central forum where continuous study and further clarification of the performance-based movement might take place.

While the Texas Teacher Center Project is of particular interest to AACTE's Performance-Based Teacher Education Committee, the services of the Committee are available, within its resources, to all states, colleges and universities, and groups concerned with the improvement of preparation programs for school personnel.

AACTE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Executive Committee:

William A. Hunter, President and Chairman of the Board; Dean, School of Education, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama 36088

George W. Denemark, Past President; Dean, College of Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506

Sam P. Wiggins, President-Elect; Dean, College of Education, The Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Robert B. Howsam, Dean, College of Education, University of Houston, Houston, Texas 77004

Sister Fidelma Spiering, Academic Dean, Marylhurst College, Marylhurst, Oregon 97036

H. Kenneth Barker, Dean, College of Education, The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio 44304

Dean C. Corrigan, Dean, College of Education, The University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont 05401

Pearlie C. Dove, Chairman, Department of Education and Psychology, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Samuel G. Gates, Executive Director, Trustees of the State Colleges in Colorado, 221 State Services Building, Denver, Colorado 80203

Henry J. Hermanowicz, Dean, College of Education, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761

Donald Hight, Professor of Mathematics, Kansas State College of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, Kansas 66762

Richard E. Lawrence, Dean, College of Education, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87120

Arthur G. Martin, Superintendent of Schools, Moorestown Township Public Schools, 109 West Second Street, Moorestown, New Jersey 08057

Bert L. Sharp, Dean, College of Education, University of Florida Gainesville, Florida 32601

Benedict J. Surwill, Dean, School of Education, Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana 59101

Kenneth R. Williams, President, Winston-Salem State University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27102

Bob G. Woods, Dean, College of Education, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, Missouri 65201

Liaison Members: D.D. Darland, Associate Director, Division of Instruction and Professional Development, NEA, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington,D.C.20036
Rolf W. Larson, Director, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington,D.C. 20006

AACTE SPECIAL SERIES ON PBTE

Number of Copies	PBTE Series	
_____	#1	"Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art?" by Stan Elam @ $2.00
_____	#2	"The Individualized, Competency-Based System of Teacher Education at Weber State College" by Caseel Burke @ $2.00
_____	#3	"Manchester Interview: Competency-Based Teacher Education/Certification" by Theodore Andrews @ $2.00
_____	#4	"A Critique of PBTE" by Harry S. Broudy @ $2.00
_____	#5	"Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Scenario" by James Cooper and Wilford Weber @ $2.00
_____	#6	"Changing Teacher Education in a Large Urban University" by Frederic T. Giles and Clifford Foster @ $3.00
_____	#7	"Performance-Based Teacher Education: An Annotated Bibliography" by AACTE and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education @ $3.00
_____	#8	"Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs: A Comparative Description" by Iris Elfenbein @ $3.00
_____	#9	"Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene" by Allen A. Schmieder (jointly with ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education) @ $3.00
_____	#10	"A Humanistic Approach to Performance-Based Teacher Education" by Paul Nash @ $2.00
_____	#11	"Performance-Based Teacher Education and the Subject Matter Fields" by Michael F. Shugrue @ $2.00
_____	#12	"Performance-Based Teacher Education: Some Measurement and Decision-Making Considerations" by Jack C. Merwin @ $2.00
_____	#13	"Issues in Governance for Performance-Based Teacher Education" by Michael W. Kirst @ $2.00
_____	#14	In process
_____	#15	"A Practical Management System for Performance-Based Teacher Educatic" by Castelle Gentry and Charles Johnson @ $3.00
_____	#16	"Achieving the Potential of PBTE: Recommendations" by the AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education @ $3.00

BILLED ORDERS: Billed orders will be accepted only when made on official purchase orders of institutions, agencies, or organizations. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. Payment must accompany all other orders. There are no minimum orders.
DISCOUNTS: A 10 percent discount is allowed on purchase of five or more publications of any one title. A 10 percent discount is allowed on all orders by wholesale agencies.

Payment enclosed_____ Amount_____

Purchase Order No._____

NAME_____

(please print or type)

ADDRESS_____

_____Zip Code_____

Please address: Order Department, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite #610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

ORDER FORM FOR RECENT AACTE PUBLICATIONS

Number of Copies

_____ "The Profession, Politics, and Society" (1972 Yearbook)
_____ Volume I and Volume II @ $6.00
_____ Volume I (Proceedings) Only @ $4.00
_____ Volume II (Directory) Only @ $3.00

_____ "Power and Decision Making in Teacher Education" (1971 Yearbook) @ $6.00

_____ "What Kind of Environment Will Our Children Have?" @ $2.50

_____ "Social Change and Teacher Education" @ $2.50

_____ "Systems and Modeling: Self-Renewal Approaches to Teacher Education" @ $3.25

_____ "Excellence in Teacher Education" (Limited Supply) @ $1.00

_____ "Beyond the Upheaval" @ $1.00

_____ "In West Virginia, It Is Working" @ $2.00

_____ "Educational Personnel for the Urban Schools: What Differentiated Staffing Can Do" @ $2.00

_____ "An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates" @ $2.00

_____ "Obligation for Reform" @ $2.00

BILLED ORDERS: Billed orders will be accepted only when made on official purchase orders of institutions, agencies, or organizations. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. Payment must accompany all other orders. There are no minimum orders.

Payment enclosed_____ Amount_____

Purchase Order No._____

NAME_____

(Please print or type)

ADDRESS_____

_____ ZIP CODE_____

Please address: Order Department, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite #610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Paul Varg, Professor of History, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823.

LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Theodore Andrews, Associate in Teacher Education, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, New York State Department of Education, Albany, New York 12204 (Multi-State Consortium)

Norman Dodl, Associate Professor, Department of Elementary Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306 (Elementary Education Model Program Directors)

Harlan Ford, Assistant Commissioner of Education (or *Tom Ryan*) Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas 78701

Norman Johnson, Chairman, Department of Education, North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina 27707 (Southern Consortium)

Kyle Killough, Director, Texas Education Renewal Center, 6504 Tracor Lane, Austin, Texas 78721 (Texas Teacher Center Project)

Donald Orlosky, Professor of Education and Associate Director of Leadership Training Institute, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620

Benjamin Rosner, University Dean of Teacher Education, Office of Teacher Education, the City University of New York, 1411 Broadway, Room 1119, New York, New York 10018 (Task Force '72 Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education)

Allen Schmieder, Chief, Operations Coordination, National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202 (Office of Education)

Emmitt Smith, Vice President, Program Development and Resources, West Texas State University, Canyon, Texas 79015 (Texas Teacher Center Project)

STAFF:

Karl Massanari, Director
Gordon Cook, Assistant Director
Shirley Bonneville, Program Assistant
Brenda Greenhowe, Secretary
Sharon DeVeauuse, Secretary